

25 November 1966

Approved For Release 2000/08/27 : CIA-RDP75-00149R000300510003-3

## CORRESPONDENCE

CPYRGHT

(Continued from page 213)

reputation as one of the most up-to-date and relevant dioceses in the country.

The pill that is most bitter to swallow in this respect is that Archbishop Cody considers himself a liberal. At the Council he voted for the principle of collegiality, while at the same time he voted again and again against an irrelevant, authoritarian Church. How can this be reconciled with the course of action he has undertaken in Chicago?

To many people the greatest failure of the post-conciliar Church has been not merely its inability to put into practice many of the basic principles which came out of the Council, but even more so its apparent unconcern in many places with even the beginnings of implementation. In the area of decentralization of authority Chicago takes its place as a prime example.



Photo by John S. Murray

In his own words—the rare blend of logic, learning, wit, and genuine concern for all who sought access to his thought

## LETTERS OF C. S. LEWIS

Edited, with a Memoir by  
W. H. Lewis

\$5.95 HARCOURT, BRACE & WORLD

Laymen, I feel, have the right and the responsibility to continually point out areas in which the Church is not responding to the challenge of the Council to update the Church. I commend Mr. Schiltz

for doing just that. He who has ears to hear, let him hear.

WILLIAM M. TAYLOR

### "Bombers for Portugal"

Buffalo, N.Y.

To the Editors: Upon receiving my copy of the October 21st issue, I noted your editorial entitled, "Bombers for Portugal." Since I was the attorney who tried this case for the United States, this is of particular interest to me and since I am a long time subscriber and rooter for COMMONWEAL, I hope that you will take my comments in the spirit in which they are given, that is, to attempt to give you as accurate a picture as possible regarding the events and background concerning this case.

The trial ended on Thursday, October 13, 1966, with the acquittal of both defendants. After rendering their verdict the jurors informally discussed their decision with the newspaper men and spectators who were in the courtroom. I have been informed that the question of CIA involvement hardly entered into their deliberation at all.

There was another indicted defendant, Gregory Board, not present at the trial, who had fled the country. Judge Henderson charged the jury that it was his duty to obtain the licenses and not the obligation of the two men on trial. Therefore, the two defendants tried were tried as conspirators and aiders and abettors. The jury simply felt that the Government had failed to show guilty intent on the part of these two men.

Enclosed is a copy of a news story by Orr Kelly, of the *Sunday Star*, Washington, dated October 16. Mr. Kelly was present during almost all phases of the trial and I believe that his wind-up story concerning this situation fairly presents the trial and the part that the CIA played. As Mr. Kelly points out in his third last paragraph, "While there is some indication of bureaucratic fumbling along the way, it now appears that the

government, far from looking the other way, acted with reasonable dispatch from the time rests, and The CI

ment function and its role was merely to pass on whatever information they had to other agencies.

It should also be noted that the information was gathered from various sources, some of unknown reliability. The Customs Agency is the enforcing agency here and, to their credit, when they did begin to act on August 20, 1965, the arrests were made within a three-week period.

I feel that in your editorial there are a few misstatements of fact, which I should like to point out. In the first paragraph you state: "The accused insist that the exporting of the planes was done with the cooperation of the CIA. The CIA denies this." Neither defendant took the stand in this case and the statement made of CIA involvement was made by the attorney for one of the defendants. The only person who testified concerning any CIA connection was the former consultant. He testified that Gregory Board told him in March 1965 that he had the tacit consent of the United States Government and the CIA. However, in cross-examination, he admitted that when he first talked to Customs Agents in September 1965, shortly after the arrest, he did not make that claim at that time. It is not disputed that later in September 1965 he talked to an officer in the Air Force Intelligence and said he believed the CIA was involved.

My view of the record is that this is the only connection with testimony of any kind involving the CIA. This man's discussions with Air Force Intelligence occurred, for the most part, after the arrest of the defendants in September 1965. Since he was a writer of aircraft subjects, he, in a regular fashion, talked to various Air Force Intelligence officers and did so during the Spring and Summer of 1965. During this period of time, he testified there were aircraft going to Portugal, but he said he discussed it with them as an aviation problem not as a political one.

In connection with the fact that the